Rm/R56 Suppl 2

FAO Fisheries Reports No. 56 Suppl. 2 FRm/R56 Suppl. 2 (En)

17/13

LIBRARY
DEC 13 1968

Supplement 2 to the Report of the fifth session of the

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MARINE RESOURCES RESEARCH

Rome, 8 - 13 July 1968

REPORT OF ACMRR WORKING PARTY ON

FAO REGIONAL FISHERIES COUNCILS AND COMMISSIONS

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
ROME, 1968

REPORT OF ACMRR WORKING PARTY ON FAO REGIONAL FISHERIES COUNCILS AND COMMISSIONS

SUPPLEMENT 2 TO THE REPORT OF THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MARINE RESOURCES RESEARCH

Rome, 8 - 13 July 1968

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, September 1968

PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

This report is the final expanded version of the draft incorporating the suggestions made by the Fourth Session of the Advisory Committee on Marine Resources Research, to which the draft was submitted as document 6/67/WP.27. The original draft was also submitted to the Sub-Committee on Development and Co-operation with International Organizations concerned with Fisheries of the FAO Committee on Fisheries as document COFI:C/1167/Inf.9.

Distribution:

FAO Department of Fisheries
FAO Regional Fisheries Officers
Members of ACMRR
FBCB Selector SM
Member Countries
IOC
Members of ACMRR Working Parties

"Current Bibliography" Entry:

ACMRR(FAO). Fifth Session, Rome, 8-13 July 1968 (1968)
FAO Fish.Rep., (56)Suppl.2:26 p.
Report of ACMRR working party on FAO regional fisheries councils and commissions. Supplement 2 to the report of the fifth session of the Advisory Committee on Marine Resources Research. Rome, 8-13 July 1968

Review. International bodies. FAO bodies. Cooperation of bodies. International action.
Do 11-184me. Co 14-1M027.

14-1M051

CONTENTS

		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	REASONS FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTION: PRINCIPLES	2
	2.1 The ends of international fisheries action	2
	2.2 The circumstances of international fisheries action	3
	2.3 The situations in which international fisheries action is likely to be needed	3
	2.4 The scope of international fisheries action	3
3	CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING INTERNATIONAL FISHERY BODIES	4
	3.1 General	4
	3.2 Structure	5
	3.3 Staff	6
	3.4 Procedures	6
	3.5 Relations with FAO and other bodies	7
	3.5.1 With FAO	7
	3.5.2 With Governments, Industry and outside scientists	7
	3.5.3 Relations with other bodies (national and international)	7
4	ASSESSMENT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF FAO FISHERY BODIES	8
	4.1 The Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council	9
	4.2 General Fisheries Council of the Mediterranean	11
	4.3 Regional Fisheries Advisory Commission for the South West Atlantic (CARPAS)	12
5	DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	13
6	APPENDICES	19

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/fao-fisheries-and-aquaculture-report_1968_56-supplement-2

1. INTRODUCTION

During its second Session the ACMRR (6 - 12 February 1964) recommended (see App. I, 5.1) that a Working Party be established to propose ways in which the work of regional councils and commissions in marine resources research might be made more effective, especially through the support that FAO might give them, with particular attention to the needs of the Indo-Pacific region. The Committee recommended the appointment to this Working Party of Dr. G. L. Kesteven (Convener), Mr. J. Adjetey, Prof. F. Gneri and Drs. C. E. Lucas and N. K. Panikkar.

During the Third Session of ACMRR (1 - 8 March 1965), the Committee was informed that FAO had not yet implemented the above recommendation. The Committee agreed that the importance of the Working Party's task had not diminished and it recommended (see App. I, 3.3) that the proposed Working Party be established and its work commence as soon as possible. It was also agreed that in order to increase the scope of the advice to FAO, members from the Mediterranean and North Pacific regions respectively should be added to the Working Party. To this purpose, the Committee recommended the appointment of Dr. J. Furnestin and Dr. P. A. Larkin.

The Convener arranged for the preliminary work to proceed through correspondence. Certain background papers on the experience and problems faced by FAO and North Atlantic fisheries councils and commissions were prepared by members, while the Secretariat circulated others (App. IV). The Group was unable to draw directly, as it had hoped, on the experience of the Commissions of the North Pacific.

Taking advantage of a visit to Rome by the Convener in November 1966, a plan of procedure and an agenda for the Working Party were drafted and agreed upon and were distributed in December 1966. The Working Party met in Rome from 9 - 14 January 1967 with the presence of the following members: Dr. G. L. Kesteven (Convener), Prof. F. Gneri, Dr. C. E. Lucas, and Dr. N. Panikkar. Because of the inability of Dr. J. Furnestin to attend the Session, the Secretariat invited Prof. H. A. F. Gohar, ACMRR member with experience in the Mediterranean, to attend, Dr. S. J. Holt, Director, Fishery Resources and Exploitation Division, welcomed the members and made some introductory remarks on the subject under consideration. The following members of the FAO staff, also, participated: Dr. M. Ruivo (Secretary, ACMRR), Mr. M. N. Mistakidis, Mr. J. E. Carroz, Mr. J. A. Tubb, Mr. D. Charbonnier, and Mr. J. Gulland.

The plan of procedure with which the Working Party began its meeting proposed a division of the work into three main sections: first, a general review, in principle, of international action in technical fields, with special reference to fishery problems; second, a scrutiny and assessment of the work of the FAO fishery bodies; and, third, a formulation of recommendations as to "the ways in which the work /of these bodies/ in marine resources research might be made more effective".

Chapters 2 and 3 of this report deal with the first of these sections, chapters 4 and 5 with the second and third. Some of the documents that furnished a background to the discussions are reproduced as appendices, others are listed in the bibliography.

2. REASONS FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTION: PRINCIPLES

The discussions that took place in the meeting of the Working Party had their starting point in a proposition that the prime reasons for setting up arrangements for international action lay in:

(i) a common need for information on which individual or joint action could be based, and

(ii) the need to dispel misunderstanding and to resolve disagreement 1/

Taking the Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council as an example, the Working Party recognized that the IPFC had, throughout its life, been playing a useful role in compiling, analyzing, and interpreting information, and that the more substantial activities of its subsidiary bodies had been in respect of this information function. The Working Party recognized that the Council had operated as a machinery by means of which national representatives had been brought together to discuss matters which lay within the Council's terms of reference and to make statements of various kinds to FAO and, through FAO, to the Council's Member Governments as to actions of various kinds, which in the Councils' views, the FAO and the Member Governments might take. Whereas the non-FAO fishery bodies have usually been constituted expressly for the purpose of proposing regulations, have been provided with machinery to serve this purpose, and have devoted considerable time and energy to this function, the FAO bodies and, in particular the IPFC, have not exercised this function although they may be considered to have the power to do so. In contrast with the non-FAO bodies, then, the FAO bodies have placed considerably more importance on the discharge of the information function than on other functions such as regulation. The Working Party recognized, therefore, that in making any comparison between the FAO bodies and the non-FAO bodies, due allowance would have to be made for this difference of emphasis, and the Working Party considered that it must undertake, at the outset, a study of the reasons for international action so as to assist it in making a reasonable comparison.

2.1 The Ends of International Fisheries Action

Obviously, the essential objective of the work of bodies such as the FAO fishery councils and commissions is to bring about agreement between nations with respect to matters on which there might be disagreement and, in consequence, conflict. But the reduction of disagreement and the avoidance of conflict are not ends in themselves: they are intermediate objectives, as means to other, more real benefits. Thus, the principal reasons for undertaking joint action may be seen to be the individual benefits of scientific, administrative, economic, 2/ or political kind that each of the participating nations might draw as a consequence of acting upon agreements reached and which, in contrast, might not be obtainable in the absence of international agreement.

1/ On the subject of international fishery bodies, see Report of the International Technical Conference on the Conservation of the Living Resources of the Sea, Rome, 1955, para. 43. See Also Recommendation on "International Fishery Conservation Conventions" modified by the 1958 U.N. Conference on The Law of the Sea.

2/ The economic benefits may be the direct rewards of economic activity or indirectly, the savings made possible by cooperation.

2.2 The Circumstances of International Fisheries Action

The case for international action is especially strong in respect of marine fisheries because of both a great risk of conflict and a very real prospect of benefits from cooperation. This case has its basis in the special circumstances of what is a major, and still largely unexploited, common resource, living within a continuous medium, the ocean, which extends over two-thirds of the world's surface. In view of this circumstance, and of the acknowledged importance of ensuring adequate supplies of animal protein, the need for international arrangements through which to secure and maintain optimum exploitation of these resources, and to avoid conflict in that activity, is real and urgent. The urgency of the need under both counts governs (or should govern) the scope, and to some extent the tempo, of work of each of the Councils and Commissions. The need for sufficient information, and for action to secure that information where it is not available, is obvious; but the peculiarity (and difficulty) of securing adequate information in respect of marine resources must be noted: in so far as the seas and oceans are vast, their current systems are extensive and variable and their flora and fauna are exceptional (to say nothing of the foreign nature of the environment itself), so the required research is arduous and even hazardous, and its programmes must be complex and prolonged.

2.3 The Situations in which International Fisheries Action is likely to be needed

It is however the common property feature of marine resources that makes international action so necessary. The resources that inhabit international waters obviously likely to come under common exploitation; but in addition, many resources have a distribution extending from territorial waters out into international waters, making them liable to multiple exploitation and making of them subjects for disputation. At the same time, it is this common property aspect that makes the cooperative activities and the exchange of information so valuable and effective. Of course the cooperation and exchange are possible only because of the activities of individuals and institutions within the countries concerned and the Working Party was at pains to ensure that none of its work should imply that fishery transactions would proceed only through international relationships.

2.4 The Scope of International Fisheries Action

Within the terms of reference of the Working Party, as a subsidiary of ACMRR, the scope of international action is primarily with respect to planning and executing resources research for fisheries management with a view to utilization of the resource. It is important, however, to recognize that there are also other aspects of fisheries work and research (from the technology of gear, fishing vessels and fish processing to economics and statistics) which may be the proper concern of international fisheries bodies; some aspects of these (perhaps especially statistics) are of direct interest for marine resources research. All are linked via the theme of utilization and all are to various degrees within the general responsibility of FAO itself, so that the regional bodies established under the Organization or within its framework must maintain the same broad view (which may not be the case for some other international bodies). The need for cooperative research, however, as distinct from the need to compile and exchange information, may be, and usually is unequally distributed and of varying urgency. The need for research on marine resources in any

situation is specially urgent (and time-consuming) because of a need to enable the Commission concerned to assess the resource (quite apart from what it might do about locating new resources) in order to determine the appropriate intensity of industrial investment, and at the same time determine the level to which fishing intensity may be taken and beyond which the yield may be threatened, and the investment thereby become uneconomically deployed.

Research on natural resources, in contrast with research in technology and economics, has a highly local and regional character. For this reason, in respect of its concern with research, the responsibility of a regional body is more direct, and the opportunity for action more immediate, in connection with resources than in connection with other fishery matters. Although the design and operation of fishing boats and gear must be particularized to the fish species to be exploited and the conditions in which the boats will operate, research on these matters can draw on a world store of knowledge and technology and can be conducted with somewhat less commitment to the local situation than is possible for any resources research. This principle holds true, with greater effect, for research into processing; storage, marketing and socio-economic matters. However, enunciation of this principle does not imply that research into non-resources questions is unnecessary. What this argument suggests is that whereas a regional body should act directly and with special initiative with regard to the resources of its region - and be assisted in this by FAO - in respect of other matters its role should be more in the sense of assisting FAO in its initiatives on behalf of larger groups of nations and often of the world. In some instances such assistance to FAO may take the form of regional symposia or seminars, but the orientation of such activities would be furnished largely by FAO.

It is characteristic of marine resources research that international cooperation is both appropriate, because of the common nature of so many of the resources, and economic in terms of national investment (direct or indirect). Further, and especially where developing countries are concerned, it is usually essential in that the national programmes of even relatively well developed countries are likely to be inadequate alone and their quota of available information consequently insufficient. It is an essential part of the regional body's tasks, therefore, to draw the available national information together, to stimulate the requisition of further and more sophisticated information, and where necessary to complement these with arrangements for securing any information still required.

3. CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING INTERNATIONAL FISHERY BODIES

3.1 General

The existing bodies may be divided into those directly within the FAO system and those, some of which were earlier in origin, outside it (although several have established relations of one kind or another with the Organization). Examples of the latter are the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), International Commission for the North East Atlantic Fisheries (NEAFC), International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC), Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) and International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission (IPSFC). The Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council (IPFC), and Comisión Asesora Regional de Pesca para el Atlántico Sudoccidental (CARPAS) are the functioning instances of the former, among which special attention has been paid, as requested, to IPFC.1/

1/ For a list of main characteristics of existing bodies, see FAO Fisheries Technical Paper No. 64.

The FAO bodies in turn must be subdivided into the Councils (IPFC and GFCM) established by international agreement under Article XIV of the FAO Constitution and the Commissions (CARPAS) 1/ established under Article VI-I, as regional subsidiary bodies by authority of the FAO Council or Conference. According to the Agreements and Statutes there are differences as regards membership and in respect of financial arrangements, although there are as yet no practical distinctions in the latter respect. A Council, while partly dependent on FAO resources, may itself have a separate budget for cooperative activities. The Commissions are wholly dependent on FAO. The fact that several of the member countries of all three FAO bodies have extremely limited resources must be noted.

Of these various international bodies, most are "regional", in the sense of comprising nations situated within or around a specified region, and fishing the stocks of that region. The International Pacific Halibut Commission and the proposed International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas are "stock" commissions, however, in the sense of being directed to the regulation of one or more species inhabiting a given region. Two important consequences arise from this distinction. In the first place, as the areas inhabited by stocks may, and frequently do, overlap, the activities of the relevant commissions are likely to overlap more and more in terms both of area and function as fishing develops; in some regions the relations may become ecological in their complexity. In the second place, perhaps especially as regards "species" commissions but potentially as regards almost any commission, the development of more powerful fishing vessels, and especially factory vessels and fleets, is resulting in the fishing of stocks by nations situated far from the region inhabited by the stock, and thus requires participation by states non-coastal to the region, which is not possible under Article VI-I. In consequence, the geographic concept of "land-based" bodies, under which the FAO bodies were formed, no longer holds good as a universal principle.

3.2 Structure

While the constitutions and specified objectives of the three operational FAO bodies differ in detail, and their methods of functioning perhaps more widely, they should be constructed and should operate so as to be able to face up to, and try to resolve "situations". This in turn demands that situations must be brought to their attention, that their only real reasons for action lie in the responses they can make to situations and that the responses can be effective only when the situations are properly specified, when competent people are available (nationally and/or internationally) to assess and to deal with the issues of such situations, and when the structure of the body is such as to facilitate and not hinder the efforts of such people. Consideration of the structure of IPFC in particular, (pages 11-15) suggests that the structure of a fishery body, if frozen deeply by statutes, may obstruct rather than serve those international actions that are the raison d'être of the body. For example,

---

1/ FAO also established a Regional Fisheries Commission for West Africa which, however, was never operative and has now been replaced by the FAO Fishery Committee for the East Central Atlantic.

the precisely defined functions of the two standing committees of IPFC may have tended in the past to preclude attention by the Council to certain matters, not only during plenary session, but also between sessions. Further, by inherent implications of rough equality between the two groups of subjects allocated to these Committees, this statutory specification may have prevented a true appreciation of the relative importance of different aspects of the Council's programme, which importance may well change from time to time. A system of ad hoc committees, such as that of CARPAS, and of some other bodies, seems to the Group much more suited to the often rapidly changing demands of fishery situations. Attention must also be drawn here to the area panels of ICNAF and of the proposed ICCAT.

3.3 Staff

Observers of international activities often overlook the fact that the success of the Secretariat of a regional body largely depends upon the personal qualities of the scientific staff, apart from the efficiency of the Secretariat viewed in an abstract and impersonal manner.

The Secretaries are key contact personnel among the member Governments on the one hand and between Member Governments and FAO on the other. In the follow-up of recommendations, in the salesmanship required in expounding the body's views to its members and in the implementation of its resolutions, the Secretaries have a demanding responsibility calling for high personal qualities of sympathy and tolerance as well as good scientific standing. Through their frequent contact with the scientists and administrators of the regions, they could accomplish much, and although their direct part in national activities may be negligible, their contribution as catalysts can be of the highest importance. It is needless to add that very great care should be exercised in their selection.

3.4 Procedures

Basically these comprise, for each of these bodies, the meetings of the Commission (Council) itself, meetings of its standing or ad hoc committee and meetings of any working groups which may be established. Adequate facilities (and therefore finance) must be available for the meetings and work of all three, and the most competent people available must be appointed to serve in them, if they are to be effective. On this count the Working Party was impressed on the one hand by the vital part played by the specialized committees and working groups of the North Atlantic fishery bodies, (especially those of ICES, which initiated them, including its Liaison Committee for providing fisheries and resource assessment information for NEAFC) and, on the other, with the number of occasions on which (according to the summary review 1/) either "funds were not available" for the establishment of such working groups under IPFC, or "the response was poor". The Working Party is convinced of the vital role which such groups can play in the regional bodies (cf. also ACMRR/1/Rec. 2) and therefore believes that when a "situation" is such as to require the appointment of one or more groups to provide a precise determination and assessment of the situation so that the body may make considered and effective decisions, the groups should be given every facility. Since an appropriate and acceptable system of financing will be essential the Working Party has submitted a scheme for consideration in Appendix II.

1/ See WP. 2 listed in Appendix IV

Directly related to the activities of the groups just considered, and of vital importance to the whole of the work of this (and of other) fishery bodies is information exchange; therefore the mechanics of information circulation and, where appropriate, of external publication, require careful study. Provision and circulation of information must be at once comprehensive and understandable, by all members of working groups, committees and plenary meetings. It is a two-way process, especially as between Member Governments, where it begins, and the fishery body, and back again in an amplified and/or digested form. This extends all the way from raw statistics, through working papers, to the published papers.

3.5 Relations with FAO and other bodies

3.5.1 With FAO

These are, in the first place, in respect of international activities within the Programme of FAO (Department of Fisheries) itself. This is again a two-way process; information and requests come in from the Council or Commission contributing to the programme, in terms both of providing "service" where that is required and of "stimulus" when that can be useful. It is vital that FAO should, in one way or another, be provided with the facilities and finance to make this "service" part of its regular programme effective. In return, FAO has the opportunity, through its regional bodies, to obtain information by maintaining contact with every aspect of their work and, from time to time, to obtain assistance from them - for example in relation to its UNDP Technical Aid and Special Fund projects. The Working Party is further persuaded that there should in any event be the maximum exchange of information between the workers under these assistance projects and those operating under the relevant regional bodies, perhaps extending to cooperation in suitable instances. So far from having to decide on which side the advantage lies in such relation between FAO and its regional bodies, it is evident that, adequately supported, the relations can bring great mutual benefits to the Organization and to the bodies.

3.5.2 With Governments, Industry and outside scientists

Relations with Governments lie in the exchange of information, arising on the one hand from the national programmes, and on the other from the regional programme, itself initiated and determined as the result of the requests of the member governments themselves. Such may all be dependent, at least in part, on FAO assistance and even on its stimulation. Contact with industry, which can be stimulating as well as distracting, is and perhaps should normally be through governments, as is much of the contact with other local scientists and scientific bodies. Other scientific contacts, which are most important, especially in the developing areas, will arise as the prestige of the central body's scientific work grows, and through relations with other bodies (see below).

3.5.3 Relations with other bodies (national and international)

First among these are the relations with other governmental fishery bodies, and again the Working Party was impressed by what it heard

of the benefits of such relations elsewhere. Some of these relations can be facilitated or (where its own bodies are concerned) implemented by FAO; yet others will arise as the reputation of a local regional body and its scientific (and other) work grows. There is a wide range of fisheries information which is relevant over a wide field of international fisheries activity, perhaps especially in neighbouring regions but, as for example in techniques and in the evolution of standards and calibrations, over much wider areas and even over the world oceans. Again, there are areas of interest between governmental fishery bodies and non-fishery bodies which can be adapted to common advantage, as for example applies between fishery bodies and others such as WMO and IMCO (and in the North Atlantic between OECD and ICES and thus with the FAO/ICES/ICNAF Continuing Working Party on Fishery Statistics). Similarly, there is common ground with some of the activities of UNESCO, especially of IOC, and the group observed with interest the relationship initiated via ACMRR between IPFC and IOC in relation to the CSK; other instances are with non-governmental international bodies such as ICSU, SCOR and with the relevant national academies.

Last, but very important, are the local universities, academies and research councils of the region, with which the closest and most active relations should be maintained. Indeed the Working Party suggests that representatives of these local academic bodies might from time to time have valuable contributions to make as members of national delegations, committees and/or working parties. As regards the academic scientists in the region and elsewhere, much will depend on the reputation of the Council's scientific work, at national and regional levels, and the quality of its publications. With this in mind, the Working Party attaches, as Appendix 3, suggestions for developing and maintaining reasonably high standards in the quality of the latter.

4. ASSESSMENT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF FAO FISHERY BODIES

Having indicated the general principles governing international action, the existing fishery organizations of an international character and the structural and functional relations of these bodies with other organizations, it is necessary to indicate the background against which the Working Party has made its study of the FAO bodies.

During the first, second and third sessions of the ACMRR attention was repeatedly drawn to the significant roles which regional fisheries organizations have played in the assessment of fishery resources of the North Atlantic and North Pacific, and the lead these organizations have given in the creation of governmental machinery for the rational exploitation of these resources. These organizations, differ in age, history and performance but most have made significant contributions. The two Fishery Councils, IPFC and GFCM, were organized with similar objectives although with broader terms of reference for fostering close cooperation amongst the concerned countries, but in both these Councils the results have not been as promising as was expected. Not only have they failed to fulfill the high hopes with which they were established but they have also become ineffective in being instruments of fishery policy for the member countries. The Working Party noted a disappointing lack of vitality in the work of the IPFC and GFCM as compared with that of North Atlantic and Pacific fisheries commissions and councils. The most recent of these bodies, CARPAS, has already shown promise, but since it has had few years of operation its performance cannot yet be judged nor its problems assessed.

4.1 The Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council

The IPFC was established in 1948 and has a current membership of 18 nations of the Indo-Pacific area, including countries which are situated in the area and those with territorial or fishery interests in the Indo-Pacific. Details of the Council's organization may be seen in ACMRR/RFB/67/WP.13.

The Council has so far met at twelve sessions. The thread that tied these countries together in the fisheries field was tenuous, the interests of the countries were diverse and common problems few. All, however, had deep interest in raising fish production and consumption in the area, in assessing the natural fishery resources and in evolving a system of utilizing these resources. The countries were fully alive to the need to enter the field of concerted action through regulation should that at any time become necessary.

In the early years the Council had considerable vitality, as was to be expected from a newly started organization. A very wide range of topics was covered during Council sessions which in the broadest sense furthered the objective of "information" as an essential prerequisite for international action. But after the first four sessions or so the proceedings began covering much the same ground except for the technical facts brought out at the symposia held during the sessions. In the meantime, many recommendations were adopted during these sessions, addressed both to member Governments and to the FAO. According to the analysis made (ACMRR, RFB/67/WP.2), the Council had made 371 recommendations till 1964, and of these 257 were made during 1956-64 alone. Out of these, 136 have been implemented, 120 were partly implemented or continuing whereas no action has been taken or reports are still awaited in respect of 115 recommendations. How is it that in spite of the very wide range of subjects considered by the Council, its effectiveness with the member countries has diminished rather than improved? Is it that the very number and generality of these recommendations have induced among member countries an apathetic attitude toward expressions of view from the Council?

In section 2.2 reference has been made to the fact that the dangers of a diminishing fish stock are strong reason for international action in fisheries, and lead countries which exploit a common stock to regulate their efforts so as to conserve the stock. The economic and social consequences of abrupt setbacks in fish yield have been a compelling reason for North Atlantic nations to seek agreement on regulation of effort. The fisheries councils have played the major part in seeking the necessary data for such agreements. In the Indo-Pacific area such situations have not so far arisen and it is difficult to say with confidence whether any fishery has exceeded the limit of optimal exploitation. A potent factor for urgent cooperation of member countries has thus been absent from the deliberation of the Council.

If countries should develop viable means of cooperation through Councils like IPFC such steps should stem from a community of interest in the work of the Council, among the participating countries. The IPFC region extends over a vast area and lacks homogeneity. In this respect it is unfortunate that the IPFC has been crippled right from the beginning by a highly attenuated area of common interest amongst the members of the Council. The member countries include those from far off regions (USA, Australia and Japan) although the hard core of council countries are those

of South and South-East Asia. The status of fisheries of the member countries varied from one extreme (Japan) to another (Burma) resulting also in widely different attitudes to problems. Many member countries have their principle fishery interests elsewhere, and the situation has again been weakened in recent years by a reduction of interest in the area on the part of certain member nations (UK, France, Netherlands).

The Working Party thought it appropriate to mention this because one possible improvement in the Council's effectiveness would come from grouping countries with common fishery stocks and problems and in comparable economic development, which groups could be recognized within the Council area. The time is probably not ripe to recognize Unit Stock Groups for which Commissions might be proposed, although in course of time such possibilities could be envisaged for Rastrelliger in which several countries have interest. 1/

Other limitations concerning the paucity of personnel and absence of organized fishery administrations have been brought out in the working papers but, while this was so during the early years of the Council, this can no longer be held valid. The position is not ideal in most countries but improvement in organizational structure of fisheries and the availability of many more trained hands at the present time do not seem to have helped the Council activities as much as should have been expected. Of greater relevance is the question of resources provided for the Council by the FAO and the member Governments. Looking through the action taken on the recommendations of the Council, it is clear that lack of resources has prevented the FAO from taking action on many recommendations.

The rapport between the then Fisheries Division at FAO Headquarters and the regional fisheries office which served as the Secretariat of the Council was feeble owing to a variety of circumstances - such as inadequacy of staff, shortage of funds for travel and often inability to agree on priorities. The coordination of TA programmes and Council recommendations was weak or non-existent. The result has been that there has been little or no follow-up action on the Council recommendations. The member countries themselves did not keep the Council fully informed of their own fisheries actions, particularly their bilateral relations and did not utilize the Council as a forum for evolving common policies. In fact, most countries strove their utmost not to bring to the Council questions which contained elements of controversy.

Another factor which weakened the Council was the different status of the members of delegations of member countries which handled fisheries work at the Council and of those which handled fisheries vis a vis other subjects at the FAO Regional Conferences and at the FAO General Conferences. Recommendations coming on top priority basis from the Council have not always secured the same priority in the overall FAO programmes. The member countries were also unwilling to make financial arrangements for follow-up action of their own recommendations, such as facilities for experts to meet, discuss and exchange data during intersessional periods.

1/ But in this connection see the discussion above, in Section 3.1, of "land-based" bodies.

On the positive side of the Council work the achievements have not been negligible. Although not directly traceable to Council work, the national fisheries programmes in the Council have benefited from the Council's study and recommendations - progress is particularly discernible in the field of fisheries statistics, 1/ fisheries research and training of personnel. These are also the fields in which FAO took direct initiative following Council's recommendations and such progress would have equally taken place in many other fields if there had been adequate follow-up.

The inadequacy of resources was time and again brought before the Working Party, but what is noteworthy is that while the sum of money required was often small relative to the particular matters for which funds were sought, and despite the urgency of the need for expeditious action, there was a failure to bring home to member Governments the importance of providing, without undue procedural delays, the funds for which would enable the regional office (Secretariat and Executive Committee) to take quick action on Council proposals; a suggestion which might be tried therefore is the creation of trust funds for Council work. In view of the unwillingness of many countries to subscribe separately to Council activities the Working Party suggests in Appendix II an alternative method of financing Council activities on a group country basis.

A point raised during discussions is that the comparatively greater success of the North Atlantic Commission and Councils was largely because they dealt only with stock assessment and related problems without being hampered by diversion of effort to general, technological and socio-economic problems. The Working Party is emphatic that since the IPFC and other similar Councils were formed largely to assist developing countries, such broad terms of reference as exploration and utilization of the resources are sound. The Committee structure of the IPFC two Committees - one dealing with biology and environment and the other dealing with technology and socio-economy - has perhaps been rigid. These should be sufficiently flexible to give any desirable emphasis in one or other work of the Committee, possibly through the creation of appropriate ad hoc bodies and corresponding increase of staff at headquarters and the regional office (see also section 3.3).

The Council's publications require substantial improvement. The Working Party's ideas on this are set forth in Appendix III, which although drawn up for the IPFC may well be applied to other regional fisheries councils and commissions.

4.2 General Fisheries Council of the Mediterranean 2/

The GFCM was established with objectives similar to those of the IPFC; some of the details of its organization and work may be found in 4/67/IP.16.

1/ This applies to commercial statistics. Data for stock assessment continue in very preliminary stages. This question of statistics is referred to in more detail in Chapter 5.

2/ FAO, having examined the activities of the Council and taken into account the recommendations contained in the present report, with the close cooperation of the GFCM Executive Committee, have already taken steps to make the GFCM a more effective body in giving guidance to national efforts in fishery development and management activities in the Mediterranean area. Proposals concerning the programme and method of work, regional cooperation, and collaboration with other bodies concerned with the Mediterranean and its resources, were considered and approved by the 9th session of the GFCM (Split, Dec. 1967).

In compactness of areas and homogeneity of the countries, this Council has many advantages over the IPFC but in performance it has been equally disappointing.

Absence of defined economic problems and the relatively low fishery potential of the Mediterranean have tended to keep the Council work to the background. An historical legacy still hampers the work of the Council in the existence in the area of an old International Commission for the Scientific Exploration of the Sea (ICEM) on the lines of the ICES. This organization whose activity has been very variable, has the support of a large body of academic scientists in the area. Recently a new non-governmental organization, the MAMBO[1/], has also been formed by Mediterranean scientists, while yet a fourth form of collaboration has been developed outside the other three. The Working Party felt that the dissipation of efforts in marine and fisheries science between these diverse organizations, and the rugged individualism of some of the scientists of the Mediterranean areas, have weakened rather than strengthened research in the area, and in particular have weakened GFCM in much of the extremely valuable role it might play in the area. A possible solution would be to bring the scientists of these organizations together and to recognize specific responsibilities which they could undertake, leaving the GFCM to develop its fishery programmes, particularly comprehensive stock assessment in the Mediterranean. Equally important is the need to forge ahead on some new programmes of common interest which would be imaginative and draw support from all Mediterranean countries.

The Committee structure of the GFCM is different from that of the IPFC. The existing five Committees cover biological, technological and environmental problems as well as publications.

4.3 Regional Fisheries Advisory Commission for the South West Atlantic (CARPAS)

This Commission was established by the FAO Conference in 1961 with membership open to all Member Nations of the Organization of the American continent whose territories have coasts bordering on the Western Atlantic Ocean, south of the Equator. Earlier efforts to establish a fishery council for Latin America following the pattern of the IPFC proved fruitless and the Working Party sees in the failure to establish the large Council and the success in establishing a smaller Commission evidence of the validity of the principle enunciated elsewhere by the Working Party that for success these councils and commissions must be responsible for relatively small and homogeneous areas.

Detailed information on CARPAS is given in ACMRR/RFB/67/WP.13. Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina are the present members of the Commission; at the same time it should be noted that the Commission at its last session adopted a Resolution proposing participation by other countries fishing or carrying out research in the CARPAS area, and the Working Party believes that this is a move in the right direction. The Commission has wide terms of reference to advise on international fisheries organizations and programmes, training, rational utilization of marine and inland resources and research.

1/ Mediterranean Association of Marine Biologists and Oceanologists.

The Commission has held three sessions so far and has accomplished its technical work through three working groups: (i) biostatistics and commercial statistics, (ii) publications, and (iii) coordination. Fish culture is also fostered. The three member countries have common fishing interests and the extent of cooperation between them is quite promising. Since the formation of the Commission a good lead has been given to the collection of fishery statistics in the three member countries.

A healthy feature of the work of the Commission is the close contact maintained by the Commission between academic scientists of the area and fishery officers of the governments. The Working Party has elsewhere in this report stressed the importance of associating the academic community with the work of FAO regional fishery bodies and it is noteworthy that in the case of this Commission the academic community has played a significant role, especially in the work of subsidiary bodies. In general the universities of the CARPAS member countries were places of origin of an interest in initiating directed and background research for fisheries and they persuaded governmental agencies to develop these activities.

5. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Working Party has found itself compelled to concur in the opinion (represented by the ACMRR decision to set up this Working Party) that although FAO Councils and Commissions have been of value in facilitating informal exchanges between fishery workers, they have been less effective than they might have been, and than was necessary considering the state of the fisheries, and of the food industries generally, of their regions. Moreover, their inadequacies are becoming a more serious matter of concern in view, on the one hand, of the great pace at which changes are taking place in world fisheries and on the other of the steadily worsening world food situation. It is obvious that world fishery problems will call more and more for international exchange and negotiations of the kind that can be served by these Councils and the Working Party is convinced that if these Councils are not strengthened and developed, other bodies will have to be set up to meet these responsibilities.

In its study of this matter the Working Party has become convinced that the success of a body such as IPFC, GFCM or CARPAS depends more on the capacities and intentions of the parties concerned than on any consideration of form and procedure. The latter always have some influence on the outcome of any course of action, and in some instances they may cause a complete stoppage of action. But, insofar as means can usually be found to circumvent a hindrance of form and procedure if the will is there, problems of structure and procedure may be seen as offering a ground for inaction when that is preferred, or for unselective programming and support, rather than as directly a cause of these. The Working Party's conviction on this point flows from the fact of differences of structure and procedure, observable between any two international fishery bodies (whether FAO or non-FAO), apparently uncorrelated with the differences of activity in respect of scope, efficiency or speed.

The Working Party has, in several places in this report, drawn attention to the importance of giving a regional council responsibility for a relatively small, well-defined and homogeneous area. It believes that FAO should keep this principle in mind in the event that other councils might have to be formed. However, the case of the Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council is a special one in that there appear to be advantages in maintaining the council in its present dimensions, although obivously steps should be taken to overcome some of the difficulties of

distance and disparity of interest which prevail. The Working Party believes that this could in part be met by a deepening of certain measures taken toward a sub-division of the council's activities in a regional sense. The Working Party therefore recommends that the council be invited to consider taking steps to divide its activities between a number of sub-regional bodies. In this connection the council might examine the principles inherent in the ICNAF panels and in the arrangements in this sense proposed for ICCAT. In addition, the council's attention should be drawn to the financial proposals set out in Appendix II.

The case of the Mediterranean presents special difficulties. The Working Party is convinced that in terms of FAO's objectives it is inescapable that a body with responsibilities such as have been given to the GFCM should operate on behalf of the FAO programme. The Working Party therefore recommends that FAO take steps to strengthen the structure and the activities of the GFCM. Many of the recommendations in this report will be of relevance to this task. At the same time the Working Party recommends that FAO enter into consultation with UNESCO to seek that Organizations' collaboration in strengthening the relations between GFCM and ICEMS, and so satisfying the aspirations of scientists in the area, and acting so that the impulse toward fragmentation of activities, represented by the establishment of MAMBO, might be reduced. Initiative of this kind by FAO toward UNESCO could bring only benefits in respect of the "rapport" between fisheries research and that which is carried out in respect of the environment generally.

The Working Party has presented its reasons for believing that the problems of resources research are of particular importance and urgency to the regional councils and it recommends that FAO take these recommendations into consideration in its planning of the support it gives to its councils and commissions. In this connection the Working Party again refers to relations with UNESCO, and it recommends most strongly that FAO develop arrangements that would secure the closest possible collaboration between the two organizations in promoting and assisting resources research in both directed and background aspects.

The principles of this affair are Member Governments and the Organization and it is appropriate for the Working Party to summarise its views on the role played, and to be played, by each of these principles and to formulate the proposals sought from it within this summary.

Member Governments

From its study of relevant documents, listed in Appendix IV, the Working Party is of the opinion that member Governments have themselves failed to take advantage of the benefits that could be available to them from the Councils working effectively. There is little evidence of the Councils having been asked by member Governments to resolve any problems; there is direct evidence that Governments have failed to provide the Councils with material on which Council Committees could work; national delegations have generally been small and unable to participate fully in Committee activities; many Council recommendations have been overlooked by member Governments or, if action has been taken, then the Council has not been informed. In these and in other ways the performance of member Governments has been such as to deny the Councils both the means of operation and the material on which to operate.

The Working Party believes that improvements in governmental use of these Councils and participation in the activities resulting from Council discussions would be a major element of any programme to make the Councils more effective and therefore recommends that the following matters be drawn to the attention of member Governments:

a) National delegations need in general to be enlarged and to include representatives of the different sections of national fishery programmes; and particularly efforts should be made to include members of the academic community on these delegations.

b) Arrangements should be made to secure greater continuity in representation.

c) Delegations should be well briefed and should be empowered to enter actively into Council projects.

d) Arrangements should be made to facilitate effective exchanges between national institutions during inter-sessional periods; these arrangements should include opportunities for travel in connection with Council projects.

e) Reporting on national programmes should be made more comprehensive and effective, and data from these programmes should be submitted to Council.

f) The arrangements whereby Council recommendations to member Governments are taken into consideration within each country, and acted upon (or decisions made not to act), and Council is informed accordingly, should be improved; improvements are needed in the internal arrangements for receiving material from each Council and its Secretariat, for bringing such material to the attention of all those in the country who may be concerned with the content of the material, for arranging for action appropriate to the content of the material and for communicating the result to Council. The same holds true with regard to matters originating in the country that might be brought to the Council.

The Working Party believes that the choice of objectives by a regional committee and its setting of priorities, which determine the direction and largely the pace of resources research, should take into account the views of industry and advice of those sectors of the scientific community outside the fisheries field and the Working Party therefore recommends that member Governments develop arrangements to enable the regional bodies to take advantage of these views from industry and advice from the scientific community.

FAO

By being the parent organization, possessed of various powers with respect to these Councils and holder of purse-strings, the Organization has certain obligations and responsibilities towards the Councils.

Primarily the responsibilities are in principle; that having taken the initiative to form these Councils in the interests of a world programme, and, in certain senses, standing between the Councils and their member Governments (or, at least constantly looking over the shoulder of each Council), the Organization has obligations to take steps towards ensuring that each Council could play an effective role in the total FAO programme. Considering that the Councils and Commissions are designed in particular to advise FAO on the formulation and implementation of its policy in the regions served by these bodies, the Working Party recommends that the Organization take steps to give practical effect to the principle that its Councils and Commissions are instruments of its policy and programme.

A notable consequence to the FAO Councils of being within the FAO "framework" and having their Secretariats provided by the Organization is that responsibility for initiative and action is shared with FAO. In this situation it was essential that communication between FAO Headquarters and the Council Secretariat should have been such that every opportunity for initiative was speedily recognized and every call for action immediately responded to. FAO, however, was unable to establish this condition and to some extent Council activity has been confined because, inter alia, of a tendency of the parties to wait upon one another's initiative. This effect has been especially strong in respect of statistics with, in the opinion of the Working Party, quite critical consequences to Council work. Whilst recognizing the difficulties presented by the inadequacy of national services for statistical collection, and by the particular characteristics of fisheries of developing countries, and FAO staffing problems, the Working Party believes that FAO has missed a valuable opportunity for effective work by its failure:

a) To give strong assistance to national statistical services.

b) To call upon the Council's Committees to participate in the programme to improve the quality of the statistics; and especially

c) To bring to the Councils at each of their meetings such statistical tabulations as could be prepared, to call on the Councils to interpret such tabulations for Council and FAO purposes, and to assist the Councils to make use of the statistical data.

The Working Party notes that important steps have recently been taken to remedy this situation (at present most effectively for CARPAS) and recommends most strongly that the current statistical programme be continued and developed with greatest vigour in each region.

A similar failure can be noted with respect to arrangements for enabling the Councils to draw upon and make use of the valuable store of information accumulated in Council documents. The Secretariat has not had the means to index and collate this material for Council purposes. This failure is one among a number of such items which in the Working Party's view have their origin in part in the break-down of communications referred to above, and in part in staff inadequacy, but springs originally from the failure of FAO to see these bodies as instruments of policy and programme and to make arrangements accordingly.

The Working Party therefore recommends that FAO take such steps as may be possible within its budget to increase the financial and staffing support available to its regional councils and commissions and that in such moves it take the greatest precautions to ensure the suitability for council work of the persons it appoints as secretaries to the councils, and finally that it ensure that its staff engages in an active programme to stimulate and assist the activities in which the councils are concerned.

Institutional Aspects

The Working Party gave especial consideration to suggestions that the Councils and Commissions might be given institutional means of direction and conduct of research. Members of the Party had an intimate knowledge of the active research conducted by scientific staff employed by the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, and the Party discussed at some length the advantages and disadvantages of the IATTC arrangement contrasted with the arrangements of other non-FAO bodies, such as ICES. The Party recognized that the IATTC arrangement was a special case of a concept of international research institutions. The Party could not reach any conclusion on this matter and could not do more than record the following general observations.

Theoretically a group of countries could effect important economies by arranging for the conduct of research of common interest in a single unit and such an arrangement could be of especial advantage to a group of developing countries to each of whom the cost of setting up a national institute might be prohibitive. Such an institute could very well offer common services in computing, in the provision of research vessel time, in training, and in standardization of techniques; it could very well be a precursor to national institutes in its area and, by providing adequate facilities, prove attractive enough to restrain the drift of scientists towards the centres of research of developed countries Against these advantages must be weighed the possibility that such an institute could drain away funds that otherwise might go to national institutes and thus might prejudice the prospects of setting up the national institutes; also there could be expected to be considerable difficulties in selecting the problems for investigation.

Procedure

In addition to these features of the respective roles of FAO and member Governments there are certain aspects of Council structure and procedure which, although involving FAO and member Governments, may conveniently be dealt with separately.

The Working Party is of the opinion that considerable attention should be paid to the principle of flexibility in designing the structure and procedures of these Councils. It believes that formalism in procedures and staff statutory structure are inappropriate to the kinds of activity required of the Councils and have in the past tended to frustrate efforts to accelerate Council work, more especially that of IPFC. The Working Party, therefore, recommends that the Councils and Commissions make every effort to provide the greatest flexibility in their structural and procedural arrangements, in accordance with the principles and procedures laid down by the FAO Conference.

In making this recommendation the Working Party is not suggesting that arrangements should be entered into that might in any way limit or interfere with each Government's right of decision as to its role in a Council.

Experience of other Commissions shows how (Council) effectiveness can be greatly influenced by the ease with which the scientists of member Governments are able to meet and work together. Indeed, the collection, collation and assessment of information of all kinds, which is vital to the work of any regional body, can proceed efficiently and comprehensively only by this means. The meetings of scientists during Council Sessions are insufficient for this purpose. The contrast between IPFC and ICES, for instance, in respect of what each has been able to do, is largely attributable to the difference in what each has been able to arrange of meetings of Committees and Working Parties. The IPFC situation has been difficult because of the great distances between the centres of research and the financial situation of member Governments; the heterogeneity of the region has tended to weaken the moves to overcome these difficulties. The Working Party notes that FAO has lately found means of providing funds for certain working party meetings and strongly recommends that every effort be made to expand these arrangements, so that the Councils and Commissions should be in a position to proceed expeditiously with those action programmes they consider necessary. In this connection it recommends for consideration by FAO and member Governments the proposal concerning finance set out in Appendix II of this report. The Working Party further notes that recourse has lately been made to Special Fund and other means of meeting the costs of international cooperation and, believing such a practice to be consistent with policy proposed above, recommends that this practice be continued and expanded.

Finally, the Working Party recommends that FAO and its regional bodies give the closest attention to the quality of the publications of the regional bodies and in this connection recommends for consideration the study of principles contained in Appendix III.

APPENDIX I

EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MARINE RESOURCES RESEARCH ROME, 6-12 FEBRUARY 1964

5 COORDINATION AND COOPERATION WITH OTHER BODIES

5.1 FAO Regional Fisheries Bodies (Agenda Item 6.1 - ACMRR/2/Rec. 4)

The Committee noted the large degree to which the activities it had discussed were organized on a regional basis, and recognized the importance of the regional fisheries councils and commissions in providing machinery for international exchange and collaboration in marine resources research. The Committee considered that collaboration with, and assistance to, these bodies should afford the Division a most effective means of discharging its responsibilities.

The Committee had already noted the extremely useful collaboration between the Division and several regional fisheries commissions and councils, but had to note some inadequacy in the Division's support of such bodies established by FAO itself. The Committee considered this the more unfortunate because the membership of FAO bodies is largely of developing countries, and these bodies have been established in regions where great distances, lack of trained personnel and other deficiencies make special difficulties.

The Committee discussed the fisheries problems in the area covered by the Indo-Pacific Council (IPFC). It noted that in this area existed a large proportion of the human population suffering from protein malnutrition, inadequate arable land to provide the additional required animal protein, and an abundance of fish with which to meet this human need. It concluded that the IPFC in respect of its research responsibilities had been unable adequately to stimulate fisheries development in this region, and that a massive and sustained increase in support would be needed to remedy this serious situation.

The Committee learned, during its discussion of the IPFC report, of the very slow development of several activities in which that Council is interested. Considering the size of the Indo-Pacific area, and the importance of fish to the great human population there, the Committee expressed its concern over this situation. The Committee understood that greater support from the Division in:-

(i) technical servicing of committees and working groups;

(ii) providing technical advice and aid to member countries;

(iii) accelerating the training of technical personnel;

(iv) conducting symposis and seminars, and

(v) other matters.

Some of the support described above could be provided through the Regular Programme and some through technical assistance programmes. The Committee believed the unsatisfactory situation of the IPFC was not unique and that indeed similar situations must exist with regard to the new commissions recently established in the South Atlantic, and noted that the servicing of these could not effectively be provided by a staff which was already inadequate to the earlier task.

The Committee considered that an important element of its advice to the Director-General with regard to improving the status of this Fisheries Division would relate to the Division's work with regional councils and commissions. The Committee therefore recommends the establishment of a Working Group to propose ways in which the work of these councils and commissions in marine resources research might be made more effective, especially through the support that FAO might give them, with particular attention to the needs of the Indo-Pacific region noted above.

At its final meeting, the Committee recommends the appointment to this Working Group of Dr. G. Kesteven (Convener), Mr. J. Adjetey, Prof. F. Gneri, Dr. C. Lucas and Dr. N. Panikkar.

EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT OF THE THIRD SESSION
OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MARINE RESOURCES RESEARCH
ROME, 1-8 MARCH 1965

3 GUIDELINES FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMES

3.3 FAO Regional Fisheries Councils and Commissions (Agenda Item 3.3 - ACMRR/3/Rec.1)

The Secretary informed the Committee that FAO had not yet implemented the recommendation of the Second Session (ACMRR/2/Rec.14) to establish a Working Party to propose ways in which the work of the FAO Regional Fisheries Councils and Commissions in relation to marine resources research might be made more effective. The Committee agreed that the importance of the Working Party's task had not diminished since the Second Session and it recommends that the proposed Working Party be established and start its work as soon as possible. Its terms of reference should be as originally laid down in referring particularly to the needs of the Indo-Pacific region, but in order to increase the scope of the advice to FAO, additional members should be added to the Working Party from the Mediterranean and North Pacific regions respectively. For this purpose the Committee recommends the appointment of Dr. J. Furnestin and Dr. P.A. Larkin, respectively.

APPENDIX II

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE WORK OF THE COUNCILS AND COMMISSIONS

The terms of agreement for the establishment of the Fisheries Councils (Art. 14) envisaged contributions from Member Countries for the execution of international programmes by the Council and for any special work of interest to a group of Member Countries within the Council. Such arrangements were not contemplated for the work of the Commissions (Art. 6) which have been established by the Director-General of FAO.

In practice, however, the two Councils IPFC and GFCM have not raised any funds themselves - the Secretariat for the Councils has been provided by FAO - and the actual Council work, particularly the financing of the meetings of the Executive Council, servicing the Council Sessions and the publications have been met out of a small budget of the Councils, incorporated in the FAO annual budgets.

It is obvious from the many papers available on Council work that, had more financial resources been available, the Councils would have achieved more than has actually been accomplished. This is particularly so in fields of cooperative research and programmes involving international action in resource surveys and training.

As regards raising financial contributions directly from the members of the Council, it is understood that most member Governments are against such a procedure, especially as this brings an increase in the number of organizations to which member countries have to subscribe. There is less resistance to the suggestion that increase in the annual contributions to FAO, specifically earmarked for Councils work, be made by countries in order to augment work of Councils on which they are members.

In a Fisheries Council consisting of members at varying levels of fisheries activity both actual and potential, and drawn from geographical regions covering an extensive area of the world, it is difficult to find projects of interest to all members of the Council (p.). In fact, in the IPFC, it is difficult to name one single project which will be of interest to <u>all</u> the Member Countries and this has been indicated as one of the weaknesses of the Council. It is, however, possible to recognize among the Council Countries, groups of countries having common problems, resources and developmental interest. Such problems are capable of solution, through cooperation amongst these groups of countries if such projects could be diagnosed and funded.

It could then be legitimately asked if all Member Countries should be asked to contribute to projects of interest to only a small group within the Council.

On the several suggestions for finding finances for Council activities of group countries, the Working Party recommends the following arrangement:

Group Country activities involving international action, recommended by the Regional Council, be financed by FAO in the first instance, but that the costs of such action be recovered from the concerned Member Governments by being included in the annual contributions of the Member Governments to FAO. The increase on account of these activities is likely to be marginal as compared with the total contribution of a Country to FAO, but even in the event that substantial funds become involved, an arrangement such as this would be of convenience to those governments that wish to accept the commitment.

An arrangement of this kind will enable action to be taken on many of the Council recommendations without the individual approval and finding by each and every concerned Government being required. Most of the expenditure involved would be for the movement of personnel between research institutes in the area, exchange of scientific material and equipment, and sharing common research facilities like ship time, bench space in laboratories and the like.

APPENDIX III

GENERAL PRINCIPLES WITH RESPECT TO THE PUBLICATIONS OF FAO'S REGIONAL FISHERIES BODIES

The publications of the Regional Fisheries Council or Commission would belong to the following categories:

1. Proceedings of the Council/Commission Sessions. This would be the report of the meetings published by the Council Secretariat.

2. Proceedings of Symposia held at Council Session and of special seminars, which would be the full set of papers selected for the Symposia each year, duly edited and arranged by the Convener of the Symposium. This would be published annually by the Council/Commission, or by FAO.

3. Full set of technical papers presented at a Council/Commission Session, which will be collected and issued in mimeograph form for circulation for the purpose of the Council's subsidiary bodies, although this series will not have the status of published papers.

4. A journal, which will be for selected papers from 3. above, to be issued by the Council annually or at other shorter intervals. The papers will be selected carefully in the light of the objectives of the Council and will comprise a prestige journal of the Council/Commission, which will also publish in the journal original contributions relating to fisheries investigations in the Council/Commission area. Residual publications from 3. not included in 4. should be suitably edited and published in national journals. It is hoped that in course of time all contributions which have not been published in the Council's journal will appear in the existing or new national journals issued by the Member Countries of the Council.

Instead of a journal with some commitment to periodical publication a Council may prefer to establish a numbered series of separate technical papers, but the purposes and the rules for standards proposed below would hold nevertheless.

In addition to the foregoing series reporting Council proceedings and publishing its technical documents, each Council may develop the following series:

5. Statistical Bulletin and Sampling Year Book: the first of these would contain regional statistical tabulations in such detail as national statistical services permit and as may be considered necessary by the Council. Initially this Bulletin would probably be best established by FAO Headquarters providing appropriate regional extracts from its statistical yearbooks. The Sampling Yearbook would present data on size, sex and other composition of catches (and the stocks from which the catches are taken).

6. Newsletter, or other information vehicle: conveying information on meetings, appointments, work in progress and so forth.

7. Occasional papers: being descriptive and informational notes of a rather euphemeral nature.

Rules for the Publication of Papers in the Technical Journal of the Council/Commission (This refers to Item 4 above)

1. Papers for publication should deal with fisheries investigations in the Council area embodying original work, ideas, interpretation and methodology. Papers of general interest applicable to the area from contributors in other regions would also be published.

   Descriptive papers on organisms, fishing techniques, socio-economics and statistical accounts of purely national interest will not be published as these could more appropriately be published in national journals. Taxonomic surveys of fauna and flora may be published if of sufficiently wide interest, but individual species descriptions and morphology will be outside the scope of the journal.

2. Papers for publication will be received by the Secretariat. The Council may, if necessary, designate an editor. All papers will be referred by one or more scientists other than from the institution from where the contribution originates. Papers received for publication will be handled only on the strict understanding that they are offered to the Council journal alone, provided it is published by the Council within a year of its receipt.

3. It will be the duty of the referees to ensure that the paper:

   (a) Contains new and original contribution to knowledge of fisheries resources, utilization and environmental research of the Council area and within the overall scope of Council activities;

   (b) Is written in a clear stile free from ambiguity, in languages approved for the Council journal;

   (c) Has only such illustrations as are essential, clear and reproducible in reduced form;

   (d) Has a format conforming to standards which may be laid from time to time.

4. Bulky numerical data may not be published but will be retained in the Council archives for future reference by intending workers.

5. The papers should be accompanied by an abstract not exceeding five percent of the text in length. The abstracts may be printed in all approved languages of the Council.

6. The Secretariat may arrange to print the journals annually or at such suitable intervals but would always show the date of receipt of a paper in the original and revised form, apart from the publication date. Proof corrections, reprints, etc., will be arranged in the usual manner.

7. The journal will be issued as a priced publication on a non-profit basis, available for sale but with an essential free and exchange list which will be maintained by the Council/Commission.

APPENDIX IV

LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACMRR, 1967 Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council. Summary review of the resolutions and recommendations adopted by the Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council during the period 1956-64. ACMRR:RFB/67/WP.2

_____, 1967 Proposed plan of procedure for ACMRR Working Party on FAO Regional Fisheries Bodies at its meeting, January 9-13, 1967. ACMRR:RFB/67/WP.1

CARPAS. 1966 Tercera Reunión, Montevideo. Informe de la Tercera Reunión de la Tercera Reunión de la Comisión Asesora Regional de Pesca para el Atlántico Sud-occidental, Montevideo, 25-29 de abril 1966. (Report of the Third CARPAS Meeting, Montevideo, 25-29 April 1966). FAO Fish.Rep., (34):71 p. (also issued as ACMRR:4/67/IP.11)

Carroz, J.E. & FAO Fisheries Biology Branch, 1965 Establishment, structure, functions and activities of international fisheries bodies. 1. Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council (IPFC). FAO Fish.tech.Pap., (57):35 p. (also issued as ACMRR:RFB: 1/67/WP.3)

_____, 1965 Establishment, structure, functions and activities of international fisheries bodies. 2. Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (I-ATTC). FAO Fish.tech.Pap., (58):29 p. (also issued as ACMRR:RFB:1/67/WP.4)

_____, 1966 Establishment, structure, functions and activities of international fisheries bodies. 3. Regional Fisheries Advisory Commission for the South West Atlantic (CARPAS). FAO Fish.tech.Pap., (60):28 p. (also issued as ACMRR:RFB:1/67/WP.5)

FAO, 1966 Report of the First Session of the Committee on Fisheries, Rome, 13-18 June, 1966. FAO Fish.Rep., (33):43 p (also issued as ACMRR:4/67/IP.4)

FAO, 1966 Department of Fisheries and Department of Public Relations and Legal Affairs, International fishery bodies. Papers presented at the First Session of the Committee on Fisheries, Rome, 13-18 June, 1966. FAO Fish.tech.Pap., (64):41 p. (also issued as ACMRR:4/67/IP.16)

GFCM, 1965 Rep.gen.Fish.Coun.Mediterr., (8):43 p. (also issued as ACMRR:4/67/IP.9)

MR/78810/10.68/E/1/800